



MEETING MINUTES

Time: 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Date: December 15th, 2021
Location: Baldwin Public Library
300 W. Merrill St.
Birmingham, MI 48009

MEETING MINUTES ARE RECORDED IN BLUE

Attendees:

Frank Pisano	Board President	BPL Building Committee
Melissa Mark	Board Member	BPL Building Committee
Jim Suhay	Board Member	BPL Building Committee
Rebekah Craft	Library Director	Baldwin Public Library
Jaclyn Miller	Assistant Director	Baldwin Public Library
Kristen Tait	Circulation Director	Baldwin Public Library
Steven Schneemann	Principal Architect	Merritt Cieslak Design
Ron Cieslak	Principal Architect	Merritt Cieslak Design
Dianne Schurg	Interior Designer	Merritt Cieslak Design
Matthew DeSchutter	Estimator	Frank Rewold & Sons

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Review details cost estimate- Matthew DeSchutter, Frank Rewold & Sons
 - The meeting began with Matt from Frank Rewold and Sons giving an introduction to the Spreadsheet Report provided and reviewing the exclusions noted on the cover letter.
 - Jim asked about the Exclusion items such as Architectural and Engineering fees and Matthew explained that it was not included because MCD future fees were not yet provided to FRS, but that it could be added in the revised version. Steve added that it needed to be an all- inclusive estimate.
 - Matthew asked if Asbestos testing had been done in the library, in order to address Exclusion item Asbestos Testing and Abatement, and Rebekah said that testing had been done and not abatement- and that there was still asbestos in the ceiling above the old circulation area.
 - Jim asked Matthew to include Exclusion item Inflation with an educated estimate to reflect Summer 2023 when the project would be bid. Matthew said that he would

include this in the revised version, however he noted that in today's inflationary climate it is very difficult to project what cost will look like- as many trades costs are currently changing by the week and Steve added that he had corroborated this with other Construction Managers.

- Matthew then proceeded to review the Spreadsheet Report categories with overall subtotals and explanations of each item and any aspects that may have affected the cost.

-Jim asked about the possibility of removing items from the Spreadsheet altogether, and Matthew explained that because the contingency is based on a percentage of the subtotal estimate- that simply removing an individual item would not be an accurate depiction of the revised cost as some items affect others and then the overall contingency would be adjusted.

-There was a question about the travertine listed as a paver item and why black granite was not listed. Matthew said that the cost should be relatively similar and that this revision would be made. Steve explained that it was supposed to be black granite with light travertine. Jim asked about the possibility of using a concrete aggregate instead and Steve said that there were a lot of different potential options. Matthew suggested a colored concrete and Steve added that this can look nice if the application is done right. Frank said that if colored concrete were used instead of black granite that it should not be a stamped colored concrete because it can cause slipping accidents, and Steve agreed.

- Jim asked why the percentage of the contingency was so high and why there were two types of contingency listed and Matthew explained that this was to protect the library. Steve added that contingencies are typically higher percentages in the schematic phase because it is accounting for factors/details that are not yet decided or considered. Additionally, he noted that this is why contingencies for a bid set in the CD phase tend to be 5-6% because there is a better understanding of what the actual costs would be.

- Steve suggested that the Building Committee be open to keeping several add-alternatives in case of additional funds/or inflation decrease. Rebekah suggested that these could be considered during the design development phase when things were scrutinized further prior to the construction documents phase. Steve agreed and said that you don't fully know what the cost will be until you bid out the drawing set.

-There was a brief discussion about having deductive items for the estimate versus add-alternatives, and Steve explained that this was all based on the scopes written.

- Frank asked MCD if they had thought about not using so much glass. Steve explained that they had but in order to make the addition not feel like a 4th building MCD wanted to dematerialize the building as much as possible. Steve said that either way in order to enclose the additional exterior addition, building material would be used, which are inherently expensive. He also added that he would want to be cautious about how changing materials could drastically alter the overall look of the exterior.

2. Review design revisions and options

- The next portion of the meeting was a discussion of the potential alternates:

-Jim asked if the Kawneer 1600 series wall was the same as the curtain wall- such as what was used for the previous phase and Steve, Ron and Matthew all said yes.

- Steve mentioned that the Pilkington glass wall system that was proposed is all glass which is why the cost is so high.

-As a design alternate Jim suggested doing a skylight half the size to reduce the cost and Steve explained that while this would reduce the cost, that it would not necessarily be a substantial price difference. Steve recommended that if they were not going to use the glass fin system for the skylight, that they maintain the skylight size and use a conventional system. Melissa said that while she appreciated the style of the glass fin system, she felt inclined to advocate for the conventional system for the south wall and the skylight due to cost differences.

- Jaclyn asked Matthew for a clarification of what RHGC meant on page 7 of the document and Matthew said that it stood for Rochester Hills Glass Contract.

- Frank asked Steve if he thought colored concrete could look nice as an alternative to the black granite, and Steve said yes.

- Jim asked whether instead of completely removing the south wall bench at the plaza if the south wall bench could match the existing bench along the East wall and not be floated above the pavers to reduce cost and Matthew said that it could and that he would include this in the revised cost model.

- Melissa asked Matthew if the snow melt cost was reflective of the entire exterior plaza, and he said that it was. She then asked if it could instead be used only at the main entrance as an alleyway from the sidewalk to the main entrance- as was previously discussed and Matthew said that he would add this as a deductive item on the revised spreadsheet.

-Melissa asked about the green wall and Steve explained that it was a living wall system. Jim suggested that instead of doing an entire system that less greenery could be added to reduce the overall cost.

- Matthew suggested that the planter box in the plaza could have a reduced size in order to reduce the cost. He also suggested not including the bench or using a block bench instead of the floated bench, He said that he would include this as a deductive item in the revised spreadsheet.

- Jim was concerned that even with design alternates that it would not be within budget. Steve said that whatever would be presented at the City Commission would be within budget. Steve said that he had a feeling that in order to meet the budget that the skylight would have to be removed. It was suggested that this be kept as an add-alternate in case additional funding became available.

- Jim asked about removing the large glass sliding doors from the East wall and it was agreed that this could go away.

- Melissa was concerned that the building committee would be unprepared for the City Commission meeting and requested an additional meeting and Steve said that MCD could do an additional meeting.

-An additional meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 22nd at 4:00pm.

-Frank and Jim asked Matthew if he thought it was reasonable to account for an additional 5% inflation on top of what things are at, and he said that it could be. There was a brief discussion about whether the account for a 10% inflation rate and it was determined that the budget would reflect a 5% rate. [After the meeting, the library requested that the inflation rate be increased to 7%.]

- Jim added that he felt it was unnecessary to extend the light pavers from the inside to the outside and Steve said that this could be revised later on.

- Melissa asked about including an item for shades at the South and East walls to

the budget and Steve and Matthew said that they would need to include it. Steve added that they would need to be motorized shades.

3. Discuss deliverables for January 12, 2022 BC meeting
 - Schematic level plans, building sections, outline specifications
 - rendered images of interior and exterior design
 - Design alternates
 - Final schematic design cost estimate & alternates pricing
4. Discussion presentation of schematic design package to library board
 - The next portion of the meeting was a review of the rendering comparisons and a discussion about which additional renderings the building committee would like to see at the upcoming meeting.
 - Kristen requested a view without the skylight for spatial and lighting comparison.
 - Jim requested a view with a smaller skylight and asked that that it be a deductive item for the revised budget. Jim also requested a revised skylight rendering with a smaller size skylight with the conventional framing system as a deductive item.
 - Jim requested a rendering of the East wall of the addition without the large sliding glass door.
 - Jim requested a rendering with a view of adjusting the floating bench to match the existing one instead of completely removing it from the budget.
 - Frank requested that a copy of the renderings presented during the meeting be shared with the building committee and Steve said that they could.
5. Discussion presentation of schematic design package to City Commission
 - The next portion of the meeting consisted of a discussion of which renderings and plans would need to be included for the final presentation. Additionally, how many design alternates would be included for the presentation.
6. Next (final) Building Committee meeting scheduled for January 12, 2021 4:00PM
 - An additional Building Committee meeting was scheduled for December 22, 2021 4:00PM in addition to the one previously scheduled for January 12th.

*Note: These minutes represent the best efforts of **Merritt Cieslak Design** to record discussions and decisions at this meeting. Please report any errors or omissions to the author upon review.*